



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

APOLOGIES FOR WAR.

The present Turco-Russian War, having been at its commencement quite popular in England, has called forth from its pulpits and religious papers some new and queer apologies for war in general. We quote a few specimens, with the pithy and decisive replies to them in the *London Herald of Peace* : —

1. *Commendatory mention in the Bible of Men who engaged in War.*—“But the time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and Barak, and Samson, and Jephtha, and David.” The mention of these names, “mighty warriors, captains of the armies of Israel,” as having acted *by faith*, Dr. Lee regards as a most emphatic commendation of warriors and conquerors. But does he mean to say that whatever happened in a miraculous age, when men were acting under immediate supernatural direction, was meant to be an example to us, and that we may safely do now every thing that was allowed or commended then? If so, it is obvious, by the simplest parity of reasoning, that we should be justified also in sacrificing our sons to God—for Abraham, in effect, did this “by faith”—and for entertaining spies sent by an invading power to facilitate the conquest of our own country—for the “harlot Rahab” did this “by faith,”—and both are “most emphatically commended,” in the very same chapter from which the other examples are cited.

2. *Warlike Images or Figures in the Bible.*—“Are not our Christian life and struggle set forth under this very image? Christ is the ‘Captain of our salvation;’ and we are called to be ‘good soldiers of Jesus Christ. Can we imagine that such a metaphor would have been used, if the profession of a soldier had been unlawful under the gospel? We may feel, I think, quite certain that if all wars were forbidden by the Christian dispensation, this sacred writer would not have employed such an illustration as this.” It really is not possible to imagine a stronger proof of the miserable weakness of the cause of those who undertake to defend war from the New Testament, than to find able men driven by argumentative distress to seek shelter under the shadow of such an argument as the above. For, if we are to conclude that the sacred writers, whenever they employed a metaphorical illustration, meant to imply their approval of the practice to which the metaphor relates, the advocates of slavery, of drunkenness, and of demoralizing and brutal sports, need go no further. Nay, thieves may discover a comfortable vindication of their profession. “For, is not,” to adopt this queer logic, “the solemn appearance of the Son of God to judgment, set forth under this very image? ‘The day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night.’ Can we imagine that such a metaphor would have been used, if the profession of a house-breaker had been unlawful under the gospel?” To such absurdities are able and excellent men reduced, when undertaking to establish paradoxes opposed to the whole spirit of their religion.

A FAIR TEST APPLIED TO CLERICAL APOLOGISTS FOR WAR.—Here is a book called the New Testament, professing to contain an exhibition of the principles and the spirit of Christianity. Put that book into the hands of any man,—let him be the most ignorant heathen, or the rankest infidel,—and ask him his impression as to its character. Will he not say,—will he not be *obliged* to say,—that the spirit which pervades it is that of universal love; that it is evidently designed to check and restrain the malignant and irascible passions,—anger, malice, wrath, and bitterness; to inculcate

kindness to all men, even to the extent of enduring wrong with patience and forbearance? Such always *has* been the impression produced on the minds of the heathen to the extent, in many cases, of leading them spontaneously to renounce war of every kind as unlawful to a Christian. The testimonies of our Missionaries in the South Seas, in New Zealand, in Africa, abound with confirmation of this fact.

Now, such being the manifest temper and tendency of the book, here we find a body of men expressly set apart to expound its principles, and to diffuse its influence throughout society. A conjuncture comes in the history of those nations called Christian, when the malign passions have been roused to a fearful extent. The fire of fierce resentment and wrath is everywhere smouldering, and threatening to burst into a conflagration, which will envelop all Europe in its lurid and destructive light. At such a crisis as this, how do the authorized expounders of such a book conduct themselves? Some of them, no doubt, boldly stand in the breach, with solemn and sorrowful voice to bewail and rebuke this outbreak of unholy passions. But others, instead of enforcing the admitted and notorious spirit which pervades every page of the Book, — instead of insisting on those precepts so expressly pertinent to a season of angry excitement, which enjoin forbearance, moderation, and the magnanimous endurance of evil, we find setting themselves, with most elaborate ingenuity, to *explain away* the force of all such passages, and by every violent and unnatural distortion of the obvious meaning of Scripture, straining every nerve to reconcile the religion of peace to a system which appears to most men to be in direct and glaring antagonism to its whole spirit, tendency and design. This, to say the least, is an exceedingly curious phenomenon, which we confess ourselves unable to explain.

PLEA FOR WAR AS THE CHAMPION OF LIBERTY. — Mr. Cobden, having expressed a doubt “if democracy ever gained by war,” a writer in the *Christian Spectator* made a vehement assault, from the able answer to which, we take a few extracts: —

1. *The Struggle under Cromwell against Charles I.* — The essence of his argument is compressed into this sentence: — “That the revolution of 1648 secured the privileges of Parliament against the fatal encroachment of prerogative, is as patent to every reader of our English annals as that the encroachment was made and resisted.” Whatever partial failures may have marked that great movement, “proves nothing,” he maintains, “against this only material fact — the establishment, forever, of the inviolability of representatives.” Now, sir, I really do not remember having seen a statement more daringly at variance with facts than the above. The revolution of 1648 secure the privileges of Parliament! Why, never during the whole course of our history — not even while the Stuarts maintained, in their most insolent mood, “the right divine of kings to govern wrong,” — was “privilege of Parliament,” and the whole theory of constitutional government, treated with such absolute contempt, as after the revolution of 1648 had been triumphantly established. Has the writer forgotten that the very “Long Parliament” of which he speaks, *was* “dispersed by armed force,” and all its leading members, the purest and bravest patriots of their day — Vane, Wentworth, Marten, and Algernon Sydney, — driven out by Cromwell’s musqueteers, amid the coarsest and most brutal insults from the military usurper? Is he not aware, that after having committed this high-handed act on the plea that the House then sitting did not represent the country, he himself not daring to appeal to public opinion, convoked a miserable parody of a free Parliament, not sent by the election of the people, but summoned by mere writ in his own name; and that even this poor simulacrum, com-

posed of his own creatures and nominees, not being sufficiently subservient, had to be dissolved in five months, and its remonstrant minority "cleared out by a file of musqueteers?" Need he be told, that for some time afterwards, Cromwell exercised more despotic power than the Stuarts had ever dared to do, issuing in his own name ordinances which had all the force of law, and imposing taxes on the people without even the pretence of a consent from their representatives? That the next Parliament he called was weeded of its independent members by his usual conservators of the privileges of Parliament, "four companies of musqueteers;" that the members were summoned into his presence, and after having been snubbed and insulted to their hearts' content, were told that none should again enter the House but those who would sign a test of his imposing; and that, even after this purgation, it was abruptly dissolved in less than five months, contrary to the express law under which it was convoked? And, finally, must your contributor be reminded that the most upright and illustrious members of Cromwell's fourth and last Parliament were severely punished for the mere exercise of free speech — Bradshaw removed from his judicial office, Sir Harry Vane, Rich, and Harrison committed to prison, and that the residue of the members found the door of the House guarded by soldiers, who admitted none but those who were provided with a certificate of approval from the Dictator? And yet he talks of the revolution of 1648 having "secured the privileges of Parliament," and "the inviolability of representatives!!"

No; what the revolution of 1648 secured for England, was an absolute military despotism, mildly administered indeed, but no less in utter contempt of every semblance of constitutional government, the end of which was to leave the proud fabric of the free commonwealth for which the nation had bled, "in a worse confusion," to employ the sorrowful language of Milton, "not of tongues, but of factions, than that at the Tower of Babel, and with no memorial of the work behind but in the common laughter of Europe."

2. *The American Revolution.* — I firmly believe that American independence not only might have been obtained without war, but might have been attained with far less peril to the cause of liberty than was incurred by the course actually pursued. For it was owing to a mere accident — an accident so rare that it has never occurred before or after in the history of nations — that the American war of independence did not end, as wars undertaken for freedom so frequently do, in a military despotism. It is notorious that the army, discontented with the acts of Congress, repeatedly pressed Washington to seize the supreme power by the sword. "In 1782," says M. Guizot, in his work entitled "Monk and Washington," "certain discontented officers offered him the supreme power and the crown, which he refused 'with great and sorrowful surprise.' In 1783, as the time approached for disbanding, a plan of address was circulated in the army, and a general meeting was about to take place to consult on the *means of obtaining by force* what the Congress refused in spite of justice. When he was informed of this, he expressed his severe disapprobation in an order of the day, himself called another meeting, and recalled the officers to a sense of their duty." I say, then, that nothing stood between the infant republic of America and a violent end by its own army of liberation, but the rare accident of Washington's sublime and incorruptible virtue. The friends of freedom, however, will do wisely not to run the hazard of finding a Washington in every military chieftain that may rise to the surface amid the heavings of political revolution, seeing that while there is but one Washington, your Cæsars, Cromwells, Monks, Napoleons, and Georgeys, are "plenty as blackberries."

3. *The first French Revolution.*—The first French Revolution was pre-eminently the cause of democracy—much more so than either our own or the American revolution. The liberation and elevation of peoples was its watchword. For this was it attacked by the allied forces; for this did it go forth to fight; for this was there a wide-spread sympathy with it in all countries in Europe. The great soldier whom it placed at the head of its armies, proclaimed himself as the “armed apostle of democracy.” And let it be distinctly remembered that *its* cause everywhere triumphed so far as the battle-field was concerned. But what did democracy gain by that war? Why, it gained a military tyrant incomparably more impious and despotic than the king it had displaced; and it gained the privilege of immolating its children by myriads for the personal aggrandisement of a martial adventurer, without conscience and without heart. “He left freedom chained,” says Lamartine, “equality compromised by posthumous institutions, the human conscience re-sold, philosophy proscribed, prejudices encouraged, the human mind diminished, schools converted into barracks, literature degraded by censorship, or humbled by baseness, national representation perverted, election abolished, the arts enslaved, commerce destroyed, credit annihilated, navigation suppressed, international hatred revived, the people oppressed, or enrolled in the army, paying in blood or taxes the ambition of an unequalled soldier.” That is what French “democracy gained by war” and its armed apostle!

4. *The Hungarian Revolution.*—But still more recently has the popular cause made its appeal to the wager of battle. And with what result? In France it placed the whole country in a state of siege, first under General Cavaignac, and then under Louis Napoleon, and thus prepared the way for its gliding once more, by an easy and almost necessary lapse, into a military despotism, without even the shadow of constitutional freedom. In Hungary the military champion of liberty, as is the almost uniform practice of these gentry, betrayed his sacred trust, and carried himself and his army bodily to the feet of his oppressors. But why need I particularize? The whole condition of Europe at this moment is a practical commentary on Mr. Cobden’s doubt, “if democracy ever gains any thing by war.”

MISCELLANEOUS.

LOSS OF LIFE IN WARS UNDER THE REIGN OF NICHOLAS.—The consumption of life, says the Liverpool (Eng.) Mercury, during the reign of the Emperor Nicholas has been enormous. He has carried on war with the Circassians, uninterruptedly, for twenty-eight years, at an annual cost of 20,000 lives on the Russian’s side alone—making a grand total of 600,000 Russians who have perished in attempting to subdue the independence of Circassia. In the two campaigns against Persia, as in the Hungarian campaign, and the two Polish campaigns of 1831–32, there are not sufficient data to enable us to form a correct estimate of the Russian loss, which was, in the Persian and Polish wars, enormous. In the two campaigns against Turkey, of 1826–29, 300,000 men fell, of whom, however, 50,000 perished by the plague. The loss of the Russians in various ways, since the entry of the Danubian Principalities, is understood to be 30,000. In these calculations it should be borne in mind that no estimate is attempted to be made of the sacrifice of human life on the side of those who fought for their liberties against the aggressions of Russia. If this calculation were attempted, it is probable that the result would prove that neither Julius Cæsar, nor Alexander, nor even Tamerlane, has been a greater scourge to the human race than the present Emperor Nicholas.